Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/594,595	KATO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Shin-Lin Chen	1632		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 09 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
	t prior to the data of filing a brief	will make a sectional ba		
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)				
Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>8,9,11,13-15,17 and 18</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-7</u> .				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a	
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:	
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)13. Other:				
	/Shin-Lin Chen/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1632		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the recited growth factors show efficiency in inducing mesenchymal stem cell migration, Example 4 is commesurate with at least claims 13 and 15 that the stem cell factor is administered to the site where accumulation of the mesenchymal stem cells is desired. The newly added claim 19 recites administering the growth factor with atelocollagen into the injured tissue. Applicant further argues that the administration of the stem cells into the tail vein in an animal model represents the most dispersive mode of administration and the injected stem cells are localized to the injection site of the growth factors, which demonstrates that the claimed invention is enabled and no undue experimentation is required (amendment, p. 5-7). This is not found persuasive because of the reasons of record. The term "topically" (claims 13 and 15) means applying themedicine to body surfaces. It is unclear how to apply the migration-enhancing factor topically to the injured tissue when the injured tissue is deep inside the body. The claims (except new claim 19) read on administering the mesenchymal stem cell-enhancing factor via various administration routes. The art of delivering a protein complex to various target sites in vivo was unpredictable at the time of the invention. There are various barriers before a protein can reach its target cells, for example, layers of dermal cells, blood vessel wall cell membranes, proteases and lysosomal degradation within cells, extracellular matrix between cells, gastrointestinal digestive acids, and blood-brain barrier for reaching cells in the brain. Whether the protein can reach target cells in vivo or not depends on the administration route of said protein. The claimed invention is "a method of regeneration therapy for injured tissue", which requires regeneration of the injured tissue. Although mesenchymal stem cells administered via tail vein can be localized to the injection site of growth factors, it is unclear whether sufficient MSCs can be obtained at the target injured tissue so as to provide regeneration therapy for injured tissue in vivo. The specification fails to provide adequate guidance and evidence for whether administration of the claimed factor via various administration routes would be able to reach the target site or injured tissue in a subject and whether sufficient MSCs and the claimed factor can be obtained at the target site or injured tissue so as to enhance regeneration of the injured tissue in vivo. Whether the administered MSCs and claimed factor via various administration routes would be able to enhance regeneration of the injured tissue in vivo was unpredictable at the time of the invention. Absent specification guidance, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would require undue experimentation to practice over the full scope of the invention claimed. .